

REMARKS

Claims 1-11 are all the claims pending in the application. Claims 1-3, 5-6 and 9-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,337,682 B1 (hereinafter, “Hwang”). Applicant submits the following in traversal.

Rejection of Claims 1-3, 5-6 and 9-11 under §102(b) over Hwang

In response to Applicant’s arguments in the Amendment of August 17, 2006, the Examiner continues to reject claim 1. In the Final Office Action, the Examiner argues that the drawings allegedly do not show the claimed detection unit to support “detecting in a predetermined region a maximum phase shift of the converted video signal.” See page 7. Rather, the Examiner argues that Fig. 4, S40 merely supports having a program which “detect[s] maximum variation step while moving pixel phase.”

Applicant submits that the detection unit is clearly supported in the drawings and in the specification. Not only does Fig. 3 show the detection unit 40 as receiving data from the A/D converter 10, the specification clearly explains how the detection unit 40 receives the converted video signal from the ADC 10 in paragraph 30 (emphasis added):

[30] The detection unit 40, being provided with the comparator 41 that compares the converted video signal from the ADC 10 with a reference value, the counter 43 that counts the output signal from the comparator 41, and the reference value setting unit 42 that applies the comparator 41 with a reference value, detects the phase shift of the video signal.

Therefore, Applicant requests the Examiner to re-evaluate Applicant's arguments distinguishing the claimed detection unit in claim 1 with the teachings of Hwang

In view of the above, Applicant maintains that Hwang fails to disclose or suggest an apparatus comprising a detection unit for detecting in a predetermined region a maximum phase shift of the converted video signal, in combination with other elements of claim 1.

For at least the above reasons, claim 1 is patentable.

For reasons similar to those submitted for claim 1, independent claim 6 is patentable. Specifically, Hwang fails to disclose or suggest, *inter alia*, converting an incoming video signal in a predetermined region into a digital format to output a converted video signal, and analyzing the converted signal.

The remaining claims rejected over Hwang are patentable for at least the reasons submitted in the Amendment of August 17, 2006, or at least by virtue of their dependencies from claim 1 or claim 6, or both.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116
U.S. APPLN. NO.: 10/700,627

ATTY DOCKET NO.: Q76246

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Seok-Won Stuart Lee/

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Seok-Won Stuart Lee
Limited Recognition No. L0212

Date: December 29, 2006